



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/731,181

12/09/2003

Navpreet Singh

SP-1310

6222

44388

7590

06/26/2008

Solae, LLC
4300 Duncan Avenue
Legal Department E4
St. Louis, MO 63110

EXAMINER

WEIER, ANTHONY J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1794

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/26/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/731,181	Applicant(s) SINGH ET AL.	
	Examiner Anthony Weier	Art Unit 1794	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 38 and 40-49 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 and 39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, Species B in the reply filed on 3/31/08 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the inventions were both classified in the same class and that an undue search would not be made in searching both inventions. This is not found persuasive because the search of each invention extends well beyond the mere single class/subclass classification of each invention. The search of these two inventions would take the Examiner to areas that are not completely commensurate with one another. Moreover, the search of each invention requires differing strategies.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1-37 and 39 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of copending Application No. 11/240212. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims deal significantly with the same protein material only expressed in different ways or differing combinations of claim limitations. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the composition defined in the claims of 11/240212 to have defined the soy protein material by measuring, for example, the lard gel strength rather than or in addition to the pork back fat emulsion strength as set forth in 11/240212 as a matter of preference depending on the particular tests desired in defining the soy protein composition.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-24, and 26-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamato et al.

Yamato et al discloses a soy protein material that is prepared in a manner very similar to

the method as set forth in the instant specification and, as such, is considered to possess the particular claimed product characteristics regarding gel and emulsification strength limitations. In particular, Yamato et al discloses treatment of soy protein by water extracting same in a slurry with a pH of less than 6, removal of the precipitate (or separation of soluble material), neutralizing same and then subjecting the neutralized soy protein material to a heat. In Yamato et al, the protein created is considered to have excellent gel forming ability and possesses a high emulsion stability when mixed with a pork fat (lard; see Example 1 and claims). Yamato et al further discloses preparing a protein powder that is about 86% protein (Examples). but which would be roughly 91% (and therefore a protein isolate) if calculated on a dry basis (i.e. not including the 5% of water). Yamato et al further discloses the use of the soy protein product in food products including, for example, meat products (see col. 5, lines 44-45).

6. Claims 1-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Monagle et al.

Monagle et al discloses a soy protein material that is prepared in a manner very similar to the method as set forth in the instant specification and, as such, is considered to possess the particular claimed product characteristics regarding gel and emulsification strength limitations. In particular, Monagle et al discloses treatment of soy protein by water extracting same in a slurry with a pH of, for example, 5, removal of the precipitate, neutralizing same and then subjecting the neutralized soy protein material to heat (e.g. claims). In Monagle et al, the protein created is considered to have firm, strong, gel forming ability. Monagle et al further discloses preparing a protein powder that is, for example, 82% protein on a dry basis (col. 2) as well as protein isolates which inherently have a protein content above 90% (e.g. Example 7).

Monagle et al further discloses the use of the soy protein product in food products including, for example, meat products (see Examples).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamato et al or Monagle et al.

If it is shown that Yamato et al or Monagle et al do not produce a product having the particular emulsification and gel strength values called for in the instant claims, it should be noted that each reference provides guidance as to how one may improve such variables (Yamato et al, col. 4; Monagle et al, col. 8 and adjacent Table). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have arrived at such values through routine experimental optimization using the suggested variable manipulation set forth in Yamato et al.

Yamato et al discloses only the preparation of a soy protein product of about 86% protein and is silent regarding the preparation of a soy product having a protein content between 75 and 85 % on a moisture free basis. However, the purity of the protein would be dependent on the particular source of the protein used as well as, for example, the length of time for extraction and particular separation performance employed. It would have been further obvious to have arrived at such protein content as a matter of preference depending on the particular protein started with (depending on availability, cost, etc.) as well as the allowed time and cost involved with the

extraction process and, therefore, degree of desired purity permitted in the soy protein product.

9. Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamato et al or Monagle et al and taken together with either one of Altemueller et al or Egbert et al.

The claims further call for the use of said soy protein gel in dairy food products. However, it is well known to employ soy protein gels not only in meat products but dairy foods as well as taught, for example, by either one of Altemueller et al (Abstract; col. 14; col. 29, lines 32-37) or Egbert et al (Abstract; paragraphs 5, 53, and 55). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have incorporated the soy protein gelling powder of Yamato et al or Monagle et al in dairy as well as meat products as an alternative use for such functional food ingredient.

Prior Art

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anthony Weier whose telephone number is 571-272-1409. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on 571-272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Anthony Weier
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1794

/Anthony Weier/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794

Anthony Weier
June 20, 2008